REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11-17, and 20-22. In addition, claims 33-35 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11-17, 20-25, and 29-35 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11-17, 20, 23, 24, 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Neil (US Patent 5,987,440). The Applicant has amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from O'Neil. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites that the personal profile data protection server has a protection certificate and the intermediate proxy server verifies the protection certificate of the personal profile date protection server with the published certificate. Support for this amendment is found on page 6, lines 10-21.

The Applicant's claimed invention provides an intermediate proxy server (preferably located within the user's personal environment or at the operator premises) and a protection server. The intermediate proxy server requests a certificate and signed content from the protection server over a secure connection. Furthermore, the intermediate proxy server verifies that the certificate belongs to the protection server by comparing the certificate of the protection server with a published certificate. The protection server includes an API to allow interactions with a service provider and a storing means for storing specific date and end user personal provider data. The service provider can then, through the API, request personal profile data wherein the personal profile data is delivered according to the end user privacy level.

The Examiner cites col. 5, line 26 to col. 6, line 6, col. 15, line 54 to col. 16, line 6, and Figure 2 for disclosing an intermediate proxy server supporting a first communication protocol for end user station communication. The Applicant respectfully

disagrees with this characterization. The cited passages merely disclose an "E-metro Community" which includes a plurality of members and is further described as a website. The E-metro community or any entity described within O'Neil does not describe the same functions as the intermediate proxy server. Specifically, O'Neil does not disclose an intermediate proxy server which compares a published certificate with a certificate provided by the protection server to determine the genuineness of the protection server.

Likewise, Claim 23 limitations are similar to claim 1 which are not disclosed in O'Neil. Specifically, O'Neil does not disclose an intermediate proxy server which compares a published certificate with a certificate provided by the protection server to verify that the protection server is genuine.

Claims 2, 5, 7-9, 11-17 and 20 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claims 24 and 29-31 depend from amended claim 23 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 23. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11-17, 20, 23, 24, and 29-31 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 21, 22 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil in view of Walker (US Patent 5,884,272). The Applicant has amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from O'Neil. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

In regards to claim 1, claim 1 has been amended and now recites that the personal profile data protection server has a protection certificate and the intermediate proxy server verifies the protection certificate of the personal profile date protection server with the published certificate. Support for this amendment is found on page 6, lines 10-21.

As discussed above, O'Neil does not disclose an intermediate proxy server which compares a published certificate with a certificate provided by the protection server to

determine the genuineness of the protection server. The addition of Walker does not make up the elements missing from O'Neil.

Claims 21 and 22 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 32 depends from amended claim 23 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 23. Therefore, the allowance of claims 21, 22, and 32 is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil in view of P3P ("P3P 1.0: A New Standard in Online Privacy", 09/13/2000, pp. 1-6). In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. O'Neil does not disclose an intermediate proxy server which compares a published certificate with a certificate provided by the protection server to determine the genuineness of the protection server. The addition of P3P does not make up the elements missing from O'Neil.

Claim 25 depends from amended claim 23 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 23. Therefore, the allowance of claim 25 is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 2 on page 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure. None of the art made of record discloses an intermediate proxy server which compares a published certificate with a certificate provided by the protection server to determine the genuineness of the protection server.

Additional Claims

The Applicant has added claims 33-35. Support for these added claims is found in the Applicant's specification on page 6, lines 2-8. The added claims provide limitations on the location of the intermediate proxy server. Specifically, the intermediate proxy server may be located within a personal environment of the end user, the premises of the end user, or located within an intranet utilized by the end user.

None of the cited references discloses locating the intermediate proxy server at these locations. Therefore, the allowance of claims 33-35 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: April 3, 2007

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com